

shortly before the time of laying the eggs for the Summer brood of larvæ. The eggs of this brood can be laid, therefore, on both deciduous and liveoaks with the happiest of outcomes. Perhaps it is just this successful outcome of the Spring's essays in maternity that breeds in *Phryganidia* that unwarranted confidence in the white oak that is annually attended with such fatal results to the Autumn young. *Phryganidia* has already one serious obstacle to its increase in the person of one *Pimpla behrensi*, who makes a point of killing a large proportion of the *Phryganidia* youth each year, and it will be well for our interesting moth to refrain from too many imprudences if it wishes to hold its own in the lively struggle for living.

---

ON THE GENUS MELEOMA A. Fitch.—The very interesting article by Mr. Banks in the ENT. NEWS for March, 1896 (pp. 95, 96), induced me to re-examine my material for this genus. I find two forms in four examples, all collected by the late H. K. Morrison and received by me from him. One specimen from Mt. Washington was seen by the late Dr. Hagen and bears his label, "*O. signoreti*;" another, from Mt. Washington agrees perfectly therewith, save that the antennæ are paler; both of these agree structurally with *M. signoreti* as defined by Mr. Banks. A third from Colorado, and the fourth, from Mt. Washington, agree structurally and otherwise with the description of *M. stossonæ* Banks, the only discrepancy between them being that in the third the black line on the sides of the face is continuous (as described), whereas in the fourth this line is broken up into two separate spots one on the genæ, the other on the clypeus (such a variation is very frequent in Chrysopidæ). These two forms differ immensely in the structure of the apex of the abdomen, and were unhesitatingly placed in my collection as *the sexes of one species*; such also was Dr. Hagen's opinion according to notes he sent to me. Now, however, Mr. Banks says he has the female of *M. stossonæ*, and that it differs from *Chrysopa* chiefly in the antennæ of that sex being placed more widely apart. Amongst my numerous North American Chrysopidæ I can find nothing that will answer to this description. That the two *M. signoreti* and the two *M. stossonæ* in my collection are respectively of different sexes is, I think, certain. In writing these notes I would by no means imply an error of observation on the part of Mr. Banks, but the facts are sufficiently suggestive to warrant further inquiry.

While on the subject of North American Chrysopidæ it occurs to me that several species have been lately described as pertaining to my genus *Nothochrysa*. I possess only one of these, from California. In *facies* it differs somewhat from the Old World species, and more resembles *Hypochrysa*, and it is probably on the strength of such a suggestion somewhere published by me in years gone by that this latter genus has been considered North American. I think, however, its position is in *Nothochrysa* rather than in *Hypochrysa*. According to the description, *Chrysopa virginica* A. Fitch, probably belongs to *Nothochrysa*.—ROBERT McLACHLAN.